

THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XL

JUNE 22, 1942

No. 948

Influences In Our Schools Unfavorable To Religious Vocation

EDWARD F. GARESCHE, S.J.

Reprinted from THE CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL REVIEW

FOREMOST among the conditions in schools which are mentioned as hindering vocations is the tendency to direct education too much towards preparing for worldly careers, for professions and business and not enough towards the religious life. It is natural enough that our schools should vision the after careers of their students as spent in the world of business, education, letters, journalism, because these are the careers towards which the majority of our Catholic students tend. In preparing them for such work, therefore, the schools only meet a demand and adapt themselves to the practical side of education. But the methods of education have become so highly developed, to put it in that way, and the demands on the teachers are so insistent and multiplied that, unless very definite, special care is taken to introduce the

religious, supernatural, Catholic elements into education, it will suffer by a process of crowding out.

What teacher does not realize this in her own experience? It is not a phenomenon peculiar to our schools. In every range of Catholic life, in every department of Catholic action, particular vigilance and energy are needed today in order to keep our activities Catholic.

Present-day civilization has become highly complicated, organized, and insistent, and the various departments of life have each one its association or its league or its union to urge and impress the standards created by the leaders of that particular department and to give that phase of life its due place and scene and development. The consequence is that, since human energy is very much limited and human interest cannot embrace more than a certain range, therefore the supernatural interests and elements of life—the religious phase of all these activities—have to be particularly stressed or they will be lost sight of to a certain degree or altogether. This is a form of what we call worldliness, the insistence and dominance of the world overshadowing and crowding out the supernatural elements of life, as the thistles in our Lord's parable overshadowed and crowded out the good seed. Hence, every stress laid on Catholic principles and teaching, every allusion tactfully and beautifully brought in to the regular work of the school, illustrating and emphasizing Catholic principles and practice, are so many indirect but powerful means towards developing vocations.

Another phase of present-day education unfavorable to vocations in the judgments of Superiors is the over-great stress laid on intellectual development to the detriment of moral development in the schools. In other words, the training of the mind is over-emphasized at the expense of the training of the will.

There is no need here to repeat the arguments about the importance of the will over the intelligence. For

a normal, well-directed life, a certain amount of intellectual development is, of course, necessary, but it is the will and not the intellect which finally determines human destiny. Now the will has its own laws. One is that it always acts for some known good, apprehended as good. Hence, the will must be presented with powerful motives which are able to sway it and keep it strong in the direction of goodness.

Another point brought up by religious Superiors is that too much social life among high school students is an impediment to vocation. We all know that the tendency is to introduce young people too early to social life in general. The youthful mind is distracted soon enough by social excitement, from what it considers the grind of study, even under normal conditions. But when this social life is intensified to a point where it interferes with studies then it becomes a real danger to vocations. It is easy enough to see how true this is. Vocation is a deliberate abandoning of the world; it is a turning away from the earth to look towards heaven. Therefore, whatever makes the world seem more attractive and tends to distract the mind and heart from things heavenly and attract them to things of the earth discourages to that extent the following of a vocation.

Significantly enough, the Superiors also stress the harm that is done to vocations in the schools by teachers who urge girls to enter Religion and especially to enter their own particular Community. No doubt they mean that urging and insistence which tends to create in the minds of the students a reaction against the religious life. This does not mean that the students should be let alone or deprived of all encouragement in this important matter of vocation, but the encouragement should be indirect by giving them a thorough and adequate knowledge of the religious life and by strengthening in them by word and example the virtues of vivid and realizing faith, and of self-sacrificing

charity which are the motives for the choice of religious life.

Even here there is room for different methods according to the different characters and characteristics of the students. There are some characters which resent earnestly any effort to sway or influence them in the direction of a vocation, while others who have all the qualities and qualifications for a religious life need someone to tell them that they would do well to enter religion. In practice, therefore, the teacher has to study the characters of the students and act towards each one as she considers most prudent in view of her own interest and of the importance of this great decision.

One Superior remarks that a very unfavorable influence on vocations is exerted by those Religious who in their conversations with their relatives, friends and pupils tend to emphasize the sacrifices involved in their religious life with the rare mention or none at all of the joys and consolations. It is, of course, natural to us all to stress the difficulties we overcome and the achievements we attain. The harder the religious life seems to others, the more they wonder at the courage and self-sacrifice of Religious. But, if the attention of the students is directed too much towards the difficulties to be overcome in religion and if they have no adequate idea of its consolations and joys, they get a one-sided notion of the life of a Sister which is very discouraging to their young and undeveloped characters.

Hence, the Sister ought to try to give the students a complete notion of the religious life and especially to avoid leaving in their minds a too harsh and severe picture of the renunciation of the Religious. The mere fact that so many hundreds of thousands of Catholic girls have embraced the religious life and lived happily in it and succeeded in becoming good Sisters shows that it does not require unusual and extreme self-

sacrifice and self-discipline, because this is not to be found in so great numbers of people. To emphasize the fact that so many other good Catholic girls have without any remarkable qualifications succeeded in the religious life surely is a wise procedure on the part of Religious.

It is also well from time to time to introduce into the school curriculum talks and lectures by priests and others who can speak with knowledge and appreciation on the religious life.

It seems wise, too, to give our students a full and correct description of the singular opportunities for personal holiness and the help of others offered her by this, the most rich in opportunities and merit of any way of life offered to women. Viewed from this standpoint, the importance of the work of the Sisters, the sources of liberty and strength that they have in their religious vocation, the training they receive, the constant calls for more and more help from the Sisterhoods—these will enable the girl with a vocation to see that the best use that she can make of herself and her life is within the Religious Community.

Sometimes the Sisters are careful and solicitous to get lectures on various secular topics and show little or no interest in talks on vocation. Perhaps they feel that by introducing these talks on vocation they may seem unduly to influence their students, but this is not undue influence; it is only wisdom to give the girls an adequate opportunity of learning about the religious life as it is and as it appears to others. More effective and prudent talks on vocation as a career for Catholic women might, we think, result in a great increase in the number of vocations.

Finally, it is the contention of the present writer, based on a good deal of thought and observation, that there are large numbers of vocations among Catholic girls that are never acted on. Many a time a Catholic woman has said that when she was younger she wanted

to enter a convent, but one thing or another interfered. Either she put it off until too late, or someone discouraged her, or she was urged to go into higher education and then forgot her earlier fervor, or perhaps she actually lacked the courage and faith to make the step when it was possible to do so.

A little thought on what has been said will point out plainly the means of developing greater numbers of vocations in our Catholic schools. We have only to emphasize those points that are favorable to vocations and to avoid as far as possible the unfavorable influences and we shall see, I am sure, a large increase in the number of those who give themselves to God in the religious life.

Neutrality and the International Conscience

F. O. TAMBIMUTTU

Reprinted from THE NEW REVIEW (India.)

NEUTRALITY is quite a modern concept. The nations, throughout the centuries of wars, have observed neutrality *de facto*. But the notion of neutrality *de jure* gradually developed only during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Present day international law owes much to Catholic theology and Catholic theologians. Francis Victoria, Hugo Grotius, and Francis Suarez have each in turn been named by Jurists: "Father of international law." In this article I propose to trace the gradual evolution of the notion of neutrality—theologically and juridically—from the time of Saint Augustine down to the League of Nations' rulings on neutrality. I present my conclusions, not as the official teaching of the Catholic Church, but as the private

opinions of several theologians and international jurists of note.

The question I attempt to solve is this: Is a powerful nation which can effectively intervene on the side of justice in a war bound to do so? Is neutrality in the face of crime itself a crime?

I presuppose that the justice of the cause of one belligerent nation and the injustice of the other can be fully established. This, in our times, is not always an easy task. Look at the conflicting Apologias of the nations at war in 1914-1918! "Each state defended or pretended to defend some sacred ideal: Serbia defended herself against absorption by Austria; Russia and Montenegro defended the peoples of their stock; Austria her "prestige" in the Balkans; Germany her fidelity to her Nibelungen ideal (*Niebelungentreue*); England defended the rights of neutrals; Japan the Mongolian interest; France fought to free the annexed provinces from the oppressors; Italy to release her subjugated Italian brethren; Armenia for the democratic ideal. Belgium alone fought in self-defence. What Turkey fought for is not apparent, but seemingly she was dragged unwillingly into the fray."¹

In the face of such conflicting war aims, a neutral is tempted to be only a passive spectator.

But let us suppose that one nation has all justice on its side. Let us suppose that the very civilization is at stake. What then are the duties of a powerful neutral?

Up to the nineteenth century, as already stated above, there was no place in the international conscience for neutrality *de jure*. On the contrary, the pre-nineteenth century idea of a just war positively excluded any intentional neutrality, because our elders considered a just war as a crusade against wicked nations. The justice of one party and the injustice of the other was quite apparent. The war was between

¹ *Church and War*. By Franziskus Stratmann, O.P., pp. 55, 56.

bandits and state soldiers; between a culpable state and a state seeking justice. In such circumstances neutrality was considered immoral, because one is bound to espouse the just cause; else it would be favoring the wicked party. The nations could be neutral if they could not ascertain which was the nation with justice on its side, or if they foresaw that their participation would be ineffective, or would bring greater evils in its train. But this is not the same as claiming neutrality as a right (*de jure*), according to our present-day definition of neutrality: "Neutrality is the attitude of a state which refuses to pronounce on the war between two belligerents, and which binds itself not to mix in others' quarrels."²

Hugo Grotius, in his work *De Jure belli ac pacis*,³ devotes a chapter to neutrals or rather to third powers. He speaks of the rights and duties of neutrals; but this is far from being the neutrality as known by the nations today. So far is it removed from our notion of neutrality, that a modern author, M. Emmanuel Descamps has roguishly translated the chapter which is headed in Grotius *De his qui bello medii sunt*, as *De ceux qui sont entre deux feus* (those who find themselves between two fires).

PASSAGE OF TROOPS

We shall first examine the evolution of the concept of *Transitus innocuus* or harmless passage of troops, belonging to a nation waging a just war, through neutral territory. Is such a passage licit or illicit? Must the neutral refuse or permit the passage of troops? According to Grotius and all his followers, this free passage must be granted to the belligerent who has justice on his side, and refused to the others. When

² *Précis de droit international*. By Professor Louis Le Fur.

³ ch. XVII bk. III. I have used for this study an old translation of Grotius, *Le Droit de la guerre et de la paix*, translated by Jean Barbeyrac and published at Amsterdam in the year 1724.

the police are pursuing bandits, they say, no one can remain neutral by system. You must help the police as much as possible without any danger to yourself. If the bandits flee through your garden, you must let the police pass through to capture the rogues, or refuse passage to the bandits, always without grave harm to yourself. In the same way must you deal with a nation seeking justice. But this passage must be harmless, *innocuus*; any damage caused to the third party must be compensated.

This notion of *transitus innocuus* has a tradition which goes back to Saint Augustine, who in turn appeals to the Old Testament.

In the Book of Numbers (cc. xx and xxi) the King of the Edomites and the King of the Amorrhéans refused the people of Israel passage through their respective territories, to the land promised to Moses and Josue by Iahveh.

In the meantime Moses sent messengers from Cades to the King of Edom, to say: "Thus saith thy brother Israel: Thou knowest all labor that hath come upon us . . . Lo, we are now in the city of Cades, which is in the uttermost of thy borders. And we beseech thee that we may have leave to pass through thy country. We will not go through the fields, nor through the vineyards, we will not drink the waters of thy wells, but we will go by the common highway, neither turning aside to the right hand, nor to the left, till we are past thy borders." And Edom answered: "Thou shalt not pass. . . . Neither would he condescend to their desire to grant them passage through his borders" (xx, 14-21)

And Israel sent messengers to Sehon King of the Amorrhites saying: "I beseech thee that I may have leave to pass through thy land: we will not go aside into the vineyards or the fields, we will not drink waters of thy wells, we will go to the king's highway, till we be past thy borders." But Sehon rather gathering an army, went forth to meet them. . . .

Saint Augustine, commenting on these passages, says that the *transitus innocuus* should have been granted by the Amorrhéans and the Edomites by virtue of the rights of mankind. *Notandum est quemadmodum justa bella gerebantur innoxius enim transitus negabatur, qui jure humanæ societatis æquissimo patere*

debebat.⁴ (Note that though they were just wars, innocuous passage was denied which was evidently to be allowed by the law of human society.)

This celebrated text of Saint Augustine was reproduced and propagated in the *Decretum Gratianum*⁵ where it was said, "It is well to remark for what reasons the children of Israel waged war against the Amorrheans. It was because the Amorrheans refused the right of passage, a right which it is but equitable to give, according to the just rules of the rights of mankind."

Yves de Chartres also held this view. Francis Suarez refers to Saint Augustine's text and speaks of it as a universally known truth which has no need of any comment or demonstration. The very refusal of a free passage was a just title to wage war: *quia hostes denegabant transitum per communes vias*.⁶

Lessius also cites the same text of the Doctor of Hippo and calls a refusal of passage an infringement of the law of nations: *si alia provincia neget nobis transitum innocuum aut commercium, quae jure gentium omnibus debentur*.⁷

Hugo Grotius is very emphatic on this point. After enumerating the general principles he cites several examples from history when free passage was demanded as a right. Thus Hercules killed Amyntor King of Orchomene for refusing passage. Argesilaus, returning from Asia, asked the King of the Macedonians passage through his kingdom. The King of the Macedonians replied: "We shall think about it." Then Argesilaus said: "All right. Let him think. In the meantime we will pass."⁸

⁴ Migne P. L. XXXIV col. 739.

⁵ Decret. Grat. II. cause XXIII. Q. 2. can. 3.

⁶ Quoted in *La Doctrine scolastique du droit de la guerre*. By Alfred Vanderpol, p. 335.

⁷ *cfr.* also *Le droit de juste guerre*. By Yves de la Brière ch. V. p. 124 ff.

⁸ Vanderpol. *Op. cit.*

⁹ Grotius. French trans. already cited p. 236 ff.

Grotius maintains that even if other passages are open, yet a just belligerent can demand passage through any of the territories he considers necessary. He demands passages not only for soldiers but also for merchandise and quotes Cicero, Plutarch, Euripides, Augustine, Ambrose, Basil, Chrysostom, and several others as holding the same view.

When theological tradition was so strong on this point, how did the nations arrive at the idea of absolute immunity of neutrals? The learned Jesuit authority on international law, Father Yves de la Brière, ascribes it to the disintegration of Christianity in Europe and to the fact that jurists no longer interested themselves in theology and the theologians no longer in law.

The jurists held that Saint Augustine wrote about a holy war waged by Divine command. His statements could not be applied to any other war. Prudence and the common good of mankind, they said, postulated perfect neutrality. This argument prevailed since the eighteenth century, especially after the publication of the *Traité de Droit des gens* by Emmerich de Vattel. (1758)

Examination of concrete circumstances rendered it impossible to apply the principle of the *transitus innocuus*. The theological concept made a clear-cut distinction between a just aggressor and an unjust belligerent. But to determine in practice who was the just party was well nigh an impossible task. Besides if one party was given free passage, the other would come to meet it and the poor neutral would suffer in consequence.

Such considerations led to the abandonment of the *transitus innocuus* theory. Father Yves de la Brière in his book *La Communauté des Puissances* traces the gradual abandonment of it by jurists such as Pufendorf, Barbeyrac, Vitriarius, and Vattel. Thus through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the old theory

was done away with because the idea of a just war no longer held good. War had assumed the nature of a duel in which success was to decide right. Neutrals had no part in it. They were spectators. The territory of third powers was thus rendered entirely immune from attack.

Various international events combined to change neutrality which was a fact into neutrality as a right.

Two leagues of neutrals were established in 1780 and 1800 against English maritime domination, grouped around Catherine II and Paul I of Russia respectively.

A little later, in the interests of European peace, diplomatic conventions crowned the evolution of the idea of neutrality by establishing three perpetually neutral states: Switzerland (1815), Belgium (1831 and 1839), Luxembourg (1867). These conventions gave a more permanent juridical status to neutrality as a right. Neutrality was finally stabilized in a systematic form as part of the Law of nations by the first and second Peace conferences held at The Hague in 1899 and 1907.

In the second conference of The Hague, there are two conventions expressly dealing with neutrality: the third and the thirteenth. The first in twenty articles treats about "the rights and duties of neutral powers in case of war on land"; the other in twenty-seven articles about the "rights and duties of neutrals in case of war at sea." These articles speak not only of the immunity of neutrals but also of the latter's duty to resist as efficaciously as possible any belligerent trying to use neutral terrain for operations against another nation.

Here are the first three articles, on which the Belgian drama of 1914 and 1940 gave a poignant and unforgettable commentary:

Art. 1. The territory of neutral powers is inviolable.

Art. 2. The belligerents are forbidden to transport across neutral territory troops, convoys, munitions, or provisions.

Art. 3. The attempt of a neutral country to resist, even by force, violation of her neutrality, cannot be considered a hostile act.

Thus, contrary to the old theological tradition, the right of perfect neutrality is juridically conferred on the nations.

After the Great War, great efforts were made by the nations to form themselves into a solid organic whole, instead of inorganic individuals prevalent before the war. This attempt at a league of nations again tends to do away with the notion of neutrality, and substitutes instead obligatory solidarity among nations, for the defense of law and order.

The Pact of the League of Nations has no place for neutrality. On the contrary, it goes back to the theories of Augustine, Suarez, and Grotius. The sixteenth article of the pact reads:

The member states of the League of Nations bind themselves to give . . . mutual aid, to resist by all means the action of a state intending to break the pact. . . . They will make the necessary arrangements to facilitate the passage across their territory of troops of all members of the League who take part in a common action, in order to respect the rulings of the League.

NEUTRAL INTERVENTION

The twelfth, thirteenth and fifteenth articles of the Pact of the League of Nations define, that if one member has recourse to war, *ipso facto*, it is considered as having committed an act of aggression against all other members of the League. Therefore the other member nations are no longer neutrals but are in a state of war. Hence, neutrality *de jure* is not only abolished, but positive interference in the interests of the League conventions is imposed.

This obligation, we may say, arises not only out of the League convention, but out of our duties of maintaining charity and justice.

Hence we can assert with the old French jurist Loysel: *Qui peut et n'empêche pêche*.⁹ This concords with theological tradition and with reason. Innumerable texts can be adduced from the writings of theologians and jurists to show that they held that intervention is obligatory. It is a rhythm running throughout Grotius. Thus, he quotes Seneca, and asks: "We punish homicides and the murder of individuals; but why do we not do the same for universal carnage of nations?"

The *Decretum Gratianum* says: "One makes himself an accomplice of injustice, when one is in a position to stop injustice, and yet does not do so." It also quotes Saint Ambrose as writing in the same strain.

Right reason too demands this. As individuals we are bound to help our neighbor in grave necessity. Are not nations also bound by the rules of charity and justice in international relations? Yes, says Pope Benedict XV.¹⁰ "There is not one Gospel law of charity among individual men, and another among cities and peoples."

The nations being all united in one big brotherhood, intervention then is obligatory on the part of a powerful nation which can render effective help. It cannot adopt the am I my brother's keeper attitude. As René Pinion writes in the *Etudes*¹¹: "In a tennis tournament or a football match we can be disinterested spectators . . . but not in the face of rampant injustice as in the invasion of Poland by Hitler." G. Coutarde asks in the *Dossiers de l'Action Populaire*¹²: "A child is being strangled in the street. Spectators watch unmoved. Do they not fail in charity and in pity? Do not say, that this is not a sin of omission. Sins of this nature, even in the matter of pure charity can be

⁹ Who can but does not prevent, sins.

¹⁰ A. A. S. 1920 p. 214.

¹¹ 1940 p. 258.

¹² 10 Dec. 1939 p. 1665.

grave." He then applies these conclusions to the present war.

René Pinon, in the article already mentioned, distinguishes neutrality of hearts, of interests, and of law. In a struggle as is going on on the battlefields today, neutrality of heart is impossible. He adds a fourth kind of neutrality, that of timidity or necessity. Individual small nations may have to be a neutral out of necessity. But this does not mean that the powerful nations are exempt from the duty of intervention.

Several modern writers, besides those already cited, are of opinion that intervention, if it can be efficacious, is obligatory when great issues are at stake. In the absence of an international police force, they say, the nations themselves must take the responsibility of safeguarding the law of nations. Non-intervention is neither obligatory nor legitimate. It never becomes legitimate, except *per accidens*, necessitated by circumstances.

Father John Murray says¹³:

Today it is commonly taken for granted that you may declare yourself indifferent to a quarrel that has arisen between two great powers until your own sacred interests—generally in the economic order—are seriously affected. But what if the cause and conduct of one of the powers be flagrantly unjust. . . . There can be a duty of intervention—a duty obliging in strict justice where treaty exists, or guarantees have been given; charity may demand, and at times does indeed demand, that other powers should intervene on the side of a country that is the obvious victim of aggression or is striving in the only way left open to it, to secure a fundamental right.

Christopher Dawson writes in the *Dublin Review*.¹⁴

In fact, neutrality in the world today is a desperate attempt to cling to a vanished order. It causes men and nations to shut their eyes to facts, even when those facts threaten their very existence, for neutrality in the old sense no longer exists. What we call neutrality covers two quite different things—the passivity of the victim who waits his turn to go to the scaffold, and the active tension of the fighter who is

¹³ *The Month* Feb. 1940 p. 82.

¹⁴ Jan. 1941 p. 1.

waiting the moment to strike and who is already a moral combatant, though he is non-belligerent in the strictly military sense.

The doctrine of non-intervention was condemned as an error in the syllabus of Pope Pius IX. He condemned the proposition: "One must proclaim and observe the principle so called of non-intervention."

Four years before the condemnation, he said in an allocution during a consistory held on September 8, 1860:

We cannot abstain from deploring among other things this deadly and pernicious principle called non-intervention, which certain governments proclaim for sometime and put into practise, even when there is question of unjust aggression of one government against another; it is of such a nature that in defiance of all laws, human and divine, they seem to guarantee immunity to those who wish to attack and despoil the rights of others, their property, and even their territory.

When the Papal States were invaded, he said: "Monstrous violation of the universal law of nations, which, if not entirely suppressed, will guarantee no force or security to any legitimate law." It is to be observed that the Pope only invokes the "law of nations."

One wonders, with the above considerations in mind, how some can consistently admit that the present aggression is being waged against Religion and civilization and yet treat it as a *res inter alios gesta*, "not our business."

* * *

When one man flatters another, it is one deceiver deceiving another: the vain deceiving the vain, the blind man deceiving the blind, the sick man deceiving the sick; and the more vain praise they bestow on each other, the more it turns to their shame.—THE FOLLOWING OF CHRIST, by Gerard Groote.

A Program for New Germany

OTTO STRASSER

Reprinted from THE CATHOLIC HERALD

IT HAS become more and more evident that the men and slogans of yesterday are certainly not in a position to carry on successfully the struggle with Hitler. Only a new and better idea is capable of producing and gathering the necessary strength, and only a challenge that points to the future is able to shake and to overthrow the system in power today. Too long the fight has been fought from pure resentment and from unfruitful feelings of hatred and negation.

For obvious reasons it is to be expected that a great part of the German emigrants still possess this outlook, whereas the German opposition inside the Reich has long since gone beyond the old party slogans and party forms, presenting in the main a spiritual unity that lacks only the opportunity to manifest itself.

It is better to become the expression of this opposition within Germany, even if this means abandoning those emigrants who are still preoccupied with parties and party lines in their reasoning.

Again, some of the emigrants do not approve of the policy of rejecting all cooperation with the Communists, consciously and uncompromisingly. It was, and still is, one of the decisive weaknesses of the fight against the Hitlerite system that this fight was, and still is, frequently under open or disguised Communist leadership. Apart from the intellectual and moral uncleanness that is thus introduced into the struggle, all real effectiveness among the German people is lost, for they have no wish to change a dictatorship in brown for one in red.

We must therefore reject all connections with any

sort of Bolshevism, just as unconditionally as connections with Nazism. In both dictatorial systems we must see the same enemy of Germany, of Europe and of the world.

The program for the creation of a truly free Germany against Hitler contains seven points.

WAR ON HITLERISM

The first aim is "War on Hitlerism and the punishment of all those guilty of its horrors." Just because I am convinced that the majority of the German people have had no share in these crimes, for just that reason I disavow all false national solidarity, and demand the restoration of the standards of justice, injured and wronged in Germany and beyond her borders.

WAR ON BOLSHEVISM

The second aim is "War on Bolshevism and every dictatorship." There can be no joint action and no compromise with Communism, just as there can be no joint action and no compromise with Fascism and Nazism.

Yet we must insist on the same clear-cut distinctions between Bolshevism and the Russian people, as *do official Vatican declarations*; this holds for the distinction between Nazism and the German people as well.

Every nation has a right to life as well as to freedom from within and without. This principle prompts not only a natural feeling of sympathy but of extending aid to every such nation which must defend its rights against the unjust attacks of aggressors.

The right of national self-determination belongs to the Russians as much as it does to the Czechs, Poles—and obviously, to the German people also. And with this we definitely include the third point of the "Atlantic Declaration" which asserts the right of nations

to determine for themselves that internal form of life and government which is best adapted to their nature.

The demands of political practice give support to such fundamental principles. Consequently, everything must be done to effect the greatest damage possible to Hitler's war machine.

The immense damage sustained by this machine to date has already had serious repercussions on the morale of the German people, thus accelerating the downfall of Nazism in a twofold manner.

To hasten this process is a demand which politics, based on realism, makes obvious. And this can be accomplished through material aid to the Russian army as well as through more intense peace propaganda among the German people themselves.

ECONOMIC SECURITY

The third aim is "Economic democracy and social cooperation."

The greatest catastrophes that have precipitated upon the world during the last three decades (of which war, Bolshevism, Hitlerism and Fascism are only various manifestations and profiteers) have been caused primarily by the instability of the economic order.

The natural striving of mankind for economic security, which is just as urgent and justified as its striving for political security, has been more and more frustrated during the last decades. The world will not arrive at a real peace and order as long as this just demand for economic security of the great masses is not fulfilled!

The dictatorships (Bolshevism, Nazism and Fascism) have to a certain extent acted in accordance with this desire—but at the expense of liberty. They have chosen the solution that is customary in prisons: where every inmate has bread and work. I see the

necessary solution for the future in the union of economic security and personal liberty! That is possible only by replacing the principle of force by the principle of cooperation, and by broadening political democracy, accordingly, to a social democracy.

In all countries present necessities have of themselves produced essential changes in economic structure and organization. But these beginnings must be brought into a comprehensive system which is inspired throughout by the spirit of social cooperation and economic necessity.

GERMANY FEDERATED

The fourth aim is "Democratic self-government and federalization of Germany."

The education of the German people makes it necessary that the forms of political democracy be simple and comparatively primitive.

Democracy in the Germany of Tomorrow will depend not on parties but on a system of vocational classes—but of course with the same, universal, direct suffrage by secret ballot as accords with the nature of every true democracy.

A second precondition, resulting from the necessary education of democracy, I see in the establishment of electoral districts of the smallest possible size, and in the arousing of interest among the voters in the democratic control of the State and of the administration. Only in this way can the excessive power of the bureaucracy in Germany be broken, for otherwise any democratic Government must be more or less superficial.

From the need for these small electoral districts and for direct influence of the electorate on the control of the State arises the necessity of a federal structure of the Reich.

A change of views and of structure should take

place in Germany itself. Only a change so far-reaching, going to the very roots of the evil, presents a real guarantee of peace.

The renunciation of Prussian centralization, of Prussian imperialism and of Prussian militarism—these three structural forms of Prussian power-politics—will of necessity lead to the political destruction of Prussia and to the restoration of the German Federal Constitution. The thousand-year history of the German Reich shows that the political structure has always been a confederation of German tribal groups, comparable in its inner multiformity to the British Commonwealth of today.

The abolishment and the partition of Prussia opens the way for a new confederacy of the German peoples (comprising districts like the Swiss cantons); the regional independence forms a natural counter-balance to centralistic misuse of power.

The federalization of Germany and the introduction of democratic self-government alone can offer the possibility of bringing the national rights of the German people in line with the requirements of their neighbors for security and the desire of the world for peace.

EUROPEAN FEDERATION

The first aim is "Formation of a European federation."

Hitler's phrase of a "New Order in Europe" meets a universal feeling of the people of Europe—only this new order cannot be based on one single people over the others.

One great aim of the Second World War must be formulated now: the voluntary cooperation of the peoples of Europe who can unite with full national freedom in a European Federation.

Only a European Federation will make possible that

universal disarmament which is necessary and the sound guarantee of economic recovery and political peace.

DEMOCRATIC FRONT

The sixth aim is "Cooperation with all democracies in the world!"

The most important prerequisite for understanding this war is the realization that this is no purely national war following the example of the last war, but this is a struggle between ideologies.

As in the religious wars of the Middle Ages, the fronts of this ideological war cut across nations, classes, even families. The phenomenon of the "Quislings" cannot be explained by the old cliché of "traitor," but only by recognizing a struggle of rival ideologies.

In every country there are today groups and forces which are consciously on the side of the "enemy," without feeling that they are "traitors to their country." Today Fascists of all kinds advocate in common what has been both theory and practice with the Communists for many years: the predominance of the Party over the nation.

In this war of ideologies it is necessary to be part of the great Front of Freedom of which the United States represents the reserve and the arsenal. The existence of Russian Bolshevism and Japanese imperialism demonstrates the urgent need of solidarity among the democracies even after the overlapping of Nazism and Fascism.

RETURN TO GOD

The seventh aim is "Return to God."

If in the above I have referred to the lack of economic planning and the political disintegration of the

last decades as the causes of the great catastrophe that has been thrust upon the world, we must now add as the deepest, underlying cause the uprooting of the soul in modern man. The industrialization, the massing of peoples, the misunderstood freedom from every tie, have led to a restlessness of spirit, a homelessness of the soul which must end in chaos and nihilism.

The dissolution of the proper relation of man to thing, of man to man, and the lack of a tie between man and God shattered the harmony which holds humanity together; without that harmony the individual is not content with himself, with society and with his lot.

It is not chance that Bolshevism, Nazism and Fascism equally deny God, and worship the idols of class or race or nation as paltry equivalents. On the other hand, we cannot fail to see that the lack of religious faith in this liberalistic era, the hostility to religion by materialistic science and also the moral sloth of many religious societies have made essential contribution to the spiritual instability of modern man, and to his estrangement from God.

A political movement cannot give a recipe for the cure of this spiritual disease. But it must support the ecclesiastical and religious communions whose task this is; and it must profess, from deep, inner conviction, its belief in Christianity and in its moral laws.

The demand for economic security, which is the basis of the new economic order we need; the demand for social cooperation within and international cooperation without, which is the guiding principle of the new political order—these must be completed and supplemented by the demand for an order of moral values such as are taught by Christianity.

Only when firmly anchored in these bases will the new political and economic order bring peace to the post-war world, and be able to endure.

Evading the Loan Sharks

W. MURPHY

Reprinted from THE LIGUORIAN

THE people of a small Ohio town were experiencing the unpleasant effects of bad business and decreased incomes. In a goodly number of homes the symbolical "wolf" was ringing the door bell: installment plans, high interest rates, important bills, urgent needs,—all demanded an immediate remedy. And a small group of one hundred and fifty Catholic parishioners found the remedy! They began a Parish Credit Union which within four months possessed savings totalling \$1,300, and recorded fifty-four loans amounting to \$860. The townsfolk watched the proceedings with a microscopic eye; so revealing were the results that now the Protestant church in the same community is going to start a credit union.

The Parish Credit Union is not a clever device by which the pastor discovers the financial status of his parishioners. It is a true, beneficial cooperative society organized of, by, and for the members of a parish for three important purposes: to educate themselves in the management and control of their own money and advancement; to promote thrift; to make small loans to themselves at a low cost.

For about a century the credit union idea has been assisting people in various parts of the world. When in 1921 the program began to be taught and developed in the United States, the front-porch philosophers called the movement "high falutin' nonsense." True to form, they were wrong: the solid practicality of the credit union has been proven beyond a doubt. Today in the United States there are approximately 10,000 highly successful credit unions with 3,000,000 members and assets totalling \$300,000,000. In this group there are over 300 Catholic Parish Credit Unions

which are spreading day by day. What distinguishes the Parish Credit Union from the other credit unions is simply its bond of unity: it is made up only of parishioners, thereby affording a firmer link, a more intimate cooperation, a wider field of activity among people already bound together by unity of faith.

The Parish Credit Union movement becomes even more encouraging from the fact that the Catholic Church stands solidly in back of it. Being a practical expression of the cooperative plan so urgently stressed by Popes Leo XII and Pius XI, the Parish Credit Union enters into the social program of the Church. Pope Pius XII has praised and recommended the Parish Credit Union in direct words. Members of the American hierarchy have issued statements advising priests to inform their people of the idea; and lately several bishops have instigated drives toward actual foundations. And why? Because the Parish Credit Union fosters self-reliance, social responsibility, and Catholic Action! The pastor of a parish in New York City writes: "The Parish Credit Union has afforded many of my parishioners their first opportunity to save a little and to borrow when hard pressed. It helps people to help themselves, creating at the same time a spirit of self-sufficiency and self-determination." The accomplishment of such remarkable results may be seen in the following portrayal of the credit union's three-fold purpose.

1. *The education of the members in the management and control of their own money and advancement.* This first purpose of the credit union is the foundation stone of the entire movement. People are taught and shown the benefits of cooperation; the proper use of money; the economic evils confronting them. A gentleman living in Detroit, making forty-five dollars a week, complained to a Parish Credit Union secretary that at the end of each week his pockets were so empty that he couldn't afford a good meal. The secre-

tary discovered his attempt to pay fifty-three dollars a week in easy installment plans! Such an instance is not uncommon, and it clearly indicates the necessity of education and advice. Moreover, in the Catholic Parish Credit Union, this education can and should be extended to the underlying reasons constituting our democracy and economic life: why a man has a right to liberty, property, and a decent living; why he has an obligation to obey his government as well as the privilege of sharing in the rights it affords him. This is Catholic Action—the development of Catholic leadership capable of diffusing truth.

2. *The promotion of thrift.* When a person has purchased a complete credit union share or unit of saving (usually five dollars), he becomes a full-fledged member without any obligation of purchasing more shares. However, the education of such a member toward thrift and saving is a pertinent duty of the credit union. Each member must be taught unfailingly to put aside a certain sum, no matter how small, at definite intervals. As an incentive, dividends are paid on complete shares. It is truly remarkable how people who never dreamed of a bank account are thus able to accumulate a rainy-day saving fund by the regular dime or twenty-five cent deposit. An acquaintance of mine has thus managed to save \$4,000 during a period of eighteen years. A rather long time, I agree; yet this fund now spells a certain measure of security which would never have been realized except for the Parish Credit Union.

3. *The borrowing of money at a low rate of interest.* It is essential to note that the credit needs of man are intimately bound up with his natural right to live and to own property, and therefore high interest rates play a very important part in his life. As a consequence, the small loan-business charging from the legal 36 per cent per annum to an illegal 600 per cent, and the instalment plan which effectively depletes a

man's purchasing power, are two common evils against which the credit union especially strikes. An example of the former condition that comes to mind is the account of a Chicago automobile salesman who borrowed thirty-five dollars from a loan-shark, paid over one thousand dollars in interest, and was then sued for the thirty-five dollars.

Do not imagine that these usurers grasp only the ignorant! Such a contention was brought up at a local teachers' convention, only to have a check-up reveal that 300 of the teachers were patronizing loan-sharks. The instalment plan too does a capable job of bleeding a man, though he usually is unaware of it because of the more indirect method. Figure out how much more a man pays for his radio or car if it is bought on the instalment plan. The cash price is always much cheaper; and the difference saved between the cash price and the total instalment plan would facilitate a number of other purchases!

Now see how the Parish Credit Union skirts these two dangers: loans are generously allowed to members for a good reason and at rates which vary from $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to 1 per cent a month on the unpaid balance. Furthermore, up to fifty or one hundred dollars, a person's character is the only required security; the borrowing of money is handled in the strictest confidence; and the loans are payable instalments suited to the condition of the borrower. Consider this astonishing fact: a parish of 550 families ordinarily pays annually \$25,000 in interest charges alone. The Parish Credit Union could finance the needs of the parishioners at about one-third the amount charged by the finance corporations, thus saving them \$16,500. And the remaining \$8,500 would not leave the parish, because it would be distributed among the depositors or placed in the reserve-fund of the Parish Credit Union.

This program is a golden opportunity for every

parish and every parishioner. The explanation and actual organization of the Parish Credit Union is under the supervision of an official organizer; each member regardless of his number of shares has only one vote in the election of officers; and for their protection either the Federal or State government maintains a strict watch over the proceedings. It is practical to note that since a parishioner needs only fifty cents to become a member, no one is really too poor to join. A twenty-five cent entrance fee is placed in the reserve-fund for bad loans; and another twenty-five cents is paid on the first share of stock. Until the first share of five dollars is fully purchased, the member continues his or her twenty-five cent payment at definite intervals. In the past people have argued their inability to become a member because of the expense. But in the process of arguing a man might consume two ten-cent cigars, and after the argument a woman might go off to a forty-cent movie. Actions refuted their own words.

During this war-period our smug philosophy of how the world goes 'round has been literally ripped and torn to shreds. We are now looking for something solidly worthwhile. This is why the Parish Credit Union should appeal to all. Of the three hundred Parish Credit Unions organized in the United States, not a single one has failed! And the good they have accomplished is remarkable. If you have an eye for a good bargain, you'll talk up a credit union in your parish if there is none, or join it if one has already been established.

* * *

We need great confidence in God during life, that at the hour of death we may trust in Him, for at that time we shall certainly find ourselves surrounded by greater temptations and sufferings both of mind and body than ever before.—SAINT FRANCIS XAVIER.

Some Things New and Old

OUR LADY OF FATIMA

When does the Feast of Our Lady of Fátima occur?

There is no Feast of Our Lady of Fátima, at least so far as the official documents of the Church show. But when you speak of Our Lady of Fátima, you speak of something objective, and the story is as follows:

It was during the last war, on May 13, 1917, to be exact, that the Blessed Virgin appeared to three shepherd children, two boys and a girl, at an out of the way place in Portugal called Fátima. It is, or rather was, not even a village, for the nearest village was a small hamlet named Cova da Ira.

However, it was on May 13, 1917, that these three simple shepherd children—two of whom are dead and the third is a nun—were favored with the Appearance of Our Lady. Now Holy Church, for all that her enemies say about her credulity, is extremely cautious about apparitions. So it was only after a very exacting inquiry by the parish priest, and after that a more exacting inquiry by his ecclesiastical superiors, that credence was given to the story of the Apparition, and a tiny chapel was allowed to be erected on the spot where Our Lady is said to have appeared.

Then the Bishop of Leiria, in whose diocese Fátima is situated, gave his approval, probably in 1918, and the tiny shrine gave place to a larger chapel, and a large church was built close by. At the last information a huge basilica was being erected over the place of the Apparition.

Once a year, on May 13, a large pilgrimage to the shrine takes place, and on the thirteenth of each month pilgrims from all parts of Portugal, and points beyond, betake themselves to Fátima to join in the devotions of Our Lady of the Rosary of Fátima—*Nossa*

Senhora do Rosario de Fátima. In 1931 the Portuguese Hierarchy gave its general approval to the devotion of our Lady of Fátima, which is, in a manner, the Lourdes of Portugal.

COMMUNICATION WITH THE DEAD

Why does the Catholic Church forbid and condemn communication with the departed?

The Catholic Church does not do anything of the kind. Indeed, the Catholic dogma of the Communion of Saints places us in direct communication with those who have departed this life. The Blessed Virgin, the Apostles and Martyrs, the Confessors, Holy Virgins and Widows whose intercessions we seek (see the Litany of the Saints) have passed beyond this world to the Beatific Vision of God, and in that Presence, which is beyond the grave, we ask, and are commanded to ask, their prayers and suffrages.

But if by communication with the departed you mean that one may call up the spirits of the departed, as the Spiritists claim to do, then that is too silly. Hear what the Holy Scripture has to say about that. In the Book of Wisdom, chapter iii, verses 1 to 3, it says: "But the souls of the just are in the hand of God, and the torments of death shall not touch them. In the sight of the unwise they seemed to die: and their departure was taken for misery: and going away from us, for utter destruction: but they are in peace."

Now it is no more than common sense that if the souls of the just are in the hand of God, they are not likely to leave that blessedness to wait upon some curiosity-monger who has the idea of calling up the spirits of the faithful departed. And, secondly, although we do not deny that their spirits may return to earth, we also state most positively that they can-

not do that without the permission of God. And if God does permit that, as He undoubtedly does for some special reason, then it is because of the Divine Will and not because some ridiculous clairvoyant claims to recall to earth the spirit of the departed. Hence you may understand what the Church of God commands, and what also she forbids.

LEO XIII

Is it a fact that Pope Leo XIII, after he was elected Pope, secretly left the Vatican to visit a foreign country?

No, there is not a word of truth in that rumor, wherever you may have heard it.

What happened is this. Before Leo XIII was elected Pope, when he was Archbishop Pecci, he paid an incognito visit to London to study the condition of the English working class. Undoubtedly what he saw had much to do with the writing of his great Encyclical on the condition of the working classes, *Rerum Novarum*.

It was in 1845, while he was still Nuncio at Brussels, that Monsignor Pecci visited London privately. He stayed at an hotel whose proprietor was a fellow Italian citizen, and was guided around London by a Belgian priest. During his stay in the English capital the future Pope had a private audience with Queen Victoria; he attended the sessions of the House of Commons, sitting in the Distinguished Strangers' Gallery, where he heard Lord Palmerston and the great Irish statesman, Daniel O'Connell, and he met also some of the chief dignitaries of the Church of England.

But it was in the East End, the vast and crowded district of London's poor, that Monsignor Pecci spent most of the time during his month's stay. It is said

of him that after he succeeded Pius IX as Pope, that he always inquired of English visitors to the Vatican if anything had been done to improve the lot of the impoverished workers in London's East End.

So much for Leo XIII having secretly left the Vatican to visit a foreign country.

On the other hand, it is said that two days after he had been elected Pope he did leave the Vatican incognito, and crossing the Tiber river, went to the Falconieri Palace to collect his papers which he had left there when he went to attend the Conclave for the Papal election. Even so, he did not leave Rome for a foreign country.

MANDALAY

Now that Mandalay has fallen to the Japanese invaders, will you tell if there is a Catholic diocese of Mandalay?

Mandalay is the title of an Apostolic Vicariate, which was founded in 1866 under the title of the Vicariate of Western Burma. The Vicar Apostolic of Mandalay is the Most Rev. Albert Pierre Falière of the Foreign Mission Society of Paris, who is titular Bishop of Clisma or Clysma.

The population of the Vicariate is 5,678,715, of whom 15,484 are Catholics, plus some 4,264 catechumens. Foreign priests working under the Bishop number 21, and there are in addition some 19 native Burmese Catholic priests.

Although it is not a territorial episcopal See, Mandalay possesses a cathedral, or, rather, did possess one. For the Catholic cathedral in the city of Mandalay was gutted on Good Friday, April 3, 1942, by the Japanese in an air raid, which laid waste a great part of the city.